

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

REC'D 29 MAR 2005

PWFO

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing <i>(day/month/year)</i> see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
---------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

International application No. PCT/B2005/050027	International filing date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 04.01.2005	Priority date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 07.01.2004
---------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G09G3/32

Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for International preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:	Authorized Officer
--------------------------------------	--------------------



European Patent Office
 D-80298 Munich
 Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
 Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Farricella, L

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7687



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050027

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - a sequence listing
 - table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - in written format
 - in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - contained in the international application as filed.
 - filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050027

Box No. II Priority

1. The following document has not been furnished:

- copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
- translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. The International Searching Authority has not been able to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed was not available to the International Searching Authority at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N) Yes: Claims 1-22
 No: Claims

Inventive step (IS) Yes: Claims 1-22
 No: Claims

Industrial applicability (IA) Yes: Claims 1-22
 No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1 : WO 03/077229 A (SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD; CHOI, BEOM-RAK; CHOI, JOON-HOO; CHAE, CH) 18 September 2003 (2003-09-18)

2. Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

an active matrix device comprising an array of display pixels (figure 1), each pixel comprising:

a current driven light emitting display element (OLED);
a drive transistor (M3) for driving a current through the display element;
first and second capacitors (C1 and C2) connected in series between the gate (P2) and the source (connected to VDD) of the drive transistor, a data input to the pixel being provided to the junction between the first and second capacitors (P1) thereby to charge the second capacitor (C2) to a voltage derived from the pixel data voltage, and a voltage derived from the drive transistor threshold voltage being stored on the first capacitor (C1).

From this, the subject-matter of independent claim 1 differs in that each pixel of the active matrix device comprises a discharge transistor connected between the junction between the first and second capacitors and a common line.

- 2.1 The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT)

The problem to be solved by the present invention may be seen as the fact that the known structure allows for measurement of the threshold voltage of the drive transistor only in the selection period in which the selection transistor (M1 in D1) is on. This limitation reduces the allowable time for display.

3. The solution to this problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) because the prior art does not suggest short-circuiting the C2 capacitor, nor is a structure allowing this short circuiting disclosed. The addition of one transistor and one driving signal line in a display matrix structure is not considered as an obvious addition to the pixel.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/050027

4. Claims 2-14 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.
5. The method claimed in claim 15 is essentially a method for using the display device claimed in claim 1. The presence of the discharge transistor and of its driving signal line allows for the setting up of a method, which compensates for the threshold voltage outside of the selection period. The method is then new and inventive, since it actually corresponds to the use of the apparatus of claim 1, which is novel and inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

The "two part form" would, in this claim, lead to an awkward definition of the method and, therefore, is not required.

6. Claims 2-14 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

REC'D 29 MAR 2005

PWPO

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050027

International filing date (day/month/year)
04.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
07.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G09G3/32

Applicant
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for International preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1b/s(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 eprmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Farricella, L

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7687



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050027

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - a sequence listing
 - table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - in written format
 - in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - contained in the international application as filed.
 - filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050027

Box No. II Priority

1. The following document has not been furnished:

- copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
- translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. The International Searching Authority has not been able to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed was not available to the International Searching Authority at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N) Yes: Claims 1-22
 No: Claims

Inventive step (IS) Yes: Claims 1-22
 No: Claims

Industrial applicability (IA) Yes: Claims 1-22
 No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

1. Reference is made to the following documents:
D1 : WO 03/077229 A (SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD; CHOI, BEOM-RAK; CHOI, JOON-HOO; CHAE, CH) 18 September 2003 (2003-09-18)
2. Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

an active matrix device comprising an array of display pixels (figure 1), each pixel comprising:

a current driven light emitting display element (OLED);
a drive transistor (M3) for driving a current through the display element;
first and second capacitors (C1 and C2) connected in series between the gate (P2) and the source (connected to VDD) of the drive transistor, a data input to the pixel being provided to the junction between the first and second capacitors (P1) thereby to charge the second capacitor (C2) to a voltage derived from the pixel data voltage, and a voltage derived from the drive transistor threshold voltage being stored on the first capacitor (C1).

From this, the subject-matter of independent claim 1 differs in that each pixel of the active matrix device comprises a discharge transistor connected between the junction between the first and second capacitors and a common line.

- 2.1 The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT)
The problem to be solved by the present invention may be seen as the fact that the known structure allows for measurement of the threshold voltage of the drive transistor only in the selection period in which the selection transistor (M1 in D1) is on. This limitation reduces the allowable time for display.
3. The solution to this problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) because the prior art does not suggest short-circuiting the C2 capacitor, nor is a structure allowing this short circuiting disclosed. The addition of one transistor and one driving signal line in a display matrix structure is not considered as an obvious addition to the pixel.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/050027

4. Claims 2-14 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.
5. The method claimed in claim 15 is essentially a method for using the display device claimed in claim 1. The presence of the discharge transistor and of its driving signal line allows for the setting up of a method, which compensates for the threshold voltage outside of the selection period. The method is then new and inventive, since it actually corresponds to the use of the apparatus of claim 1, which is novel and inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

The "two part form" would, in this claim, lead to an awkward definition of the method and, therefore, is not required.

6. Claims 2-14 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.